

926 Grand Ave
Rockford Ill
Sept 4th / 19

My dear Dr Watson

Just a week ago today we got back from Sanduski Lake. There has been so much to do getting settled at home once more - getting the children off to school &c. that letter writing has been neglected.

Thanks to your careful and critical revision of the "Willows," I would gain hope, are quite presentable - much after the fashion of the pupils sketch given character by the few bold, artistic strokes of the masters pencil - Only one thing - that peppy S. Morspuren! It ought to have been given a place somewhere by itself - being easily enough eliminated on account of its unique character. I was in no condition "even to write an order to a cobbler" when

I made that final revision
or I would have seen that I
was getting it out of place -
"capsules sessile" under "Pedicels
3-6 times the length of the fls." -
is a blunder - but I try to persuade
myself that it will not make much
confusion - and the final separation
of the ~~same~~ native species by

pedicels long - stigmas short
pedicels short, stigmas long
is enough better to compensate -

It could so easily have been
given a place just after *S.*
riminatis - thus

+ Pedicels 3-6 times the length of the fls. &c -

S. prostrata

S. discolor

&c

+ + Pedicels twice the length of the fls.

S. candida

S. physocarpa

+ + + Capsules sessile &c -

S. purpurea -

I'm sorry but on the whole, as
I said in the beginning, satisfied
that under the circumstances I see
no little that I could wish changed

The whole work has been done
at a disadvantage. The early part
of last winter I was hurried
by lots of things that lit up
entirely after "Jan 1st" - and then
to revise when I was away
from home and half-sick!

Mr Deane writes me that you
are giving me whole time to the
Manual - Looking somewhat after
six pages has thru me a
wholesome respect for the ability -
which looks after six hundred!

By the way six pages, as a gain
fine in the end is not out of the
way when we consider the space
occupied by the three species added
to the number described by Carey.

I wish I had hit upon some
more original name for S. glaucophylla
~~It was original~~ I really believed it
to be original at the time it was
given but I have since learned
that it has been used two or three
times already ~~for~~ but for species
not now recognized, nor likely to be.
Cordially M. S. Peck